

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed March 16, 2006. Claims 1-19 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-19 were rejected. Applicants add new Claims 20-22. Thus, Claims 1-22 remain pending in the Application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

In the Office Action, the following actions were taken or matters were raised:

SECTION 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,377,445 issued to Davis (hereinafter "*Davis*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Of the rejected claims, Claims 1, 8 and 15 are independent. Applicants respectfully submit that *Davis* does not disclose or even suggest each and every limitation of independent Claims 1, 8 and 15. For example, Applicants respectfully submit that *Davis* does not disclose or even suggest "a chassis support having at least one keyhole, the keyhole adapted to receive a mounting post coupled to a printed circuit board assembly" and where "the chassis support further ha[s] at least one guide adapted to align the mounting post with the keyhole" as recited by Claim 1 (emphasis added). *Davis* appears to disclose a slot 108 for receiving a standoff 110 mounted to a motherboard 106 (*Davis*, column 3, lines 11-20, figures 6-9). In the Office Action, the Examiner appears to consider only a portion of the slot 108 of *Davis* as the "keyhole" recited by Claim 1 and another portion of the same slot 108 of *Davis* (e.g., "the angled edge of slot 108" (Office Action, page 2) as the "guide" recited by Claim 1, which Applicants respectfully submit is improper. Applicants respectfully submit that one end of a slot (e.g., "the left end of slot 108" (Office Action, page 2)) is not, by itself, "a keyhole" as recited by Claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that if the Examiner intends the slot 108 of *Davis* to correspond to the "keyhole" recited by Claim 1, the slot 108 of *Davis* cannot also be considered to correspond to "a guide" for aligning a mounting post with the keyhole as recited by Claim 1 as any such proposed

interpretation would be an improper claim construction. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that in order for the standoff 110 to engage the side of the slot 108 of *Davis*, the standoff 110 of *Davis* would appear to have to be disposed within the slot 108 of *Davis* and, therefore, the standoff 110 of *Davis* would already be aligned with the slot 108 of *Davis*. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submits that *Davis* does not anticipate Claim 1.

Independent Claim 8 recites “a mounting post coupled to a printed circuit board assembly” and “a computer chassis having at least one support member, the support member having a keyhole adapted to receive the mounting post, the support member further having at least one guide adapted to align the mounting post with the keyhole” (emphasis added), and independent Claim 15 recites “means for releasably coupling the printed circuit board assembly to the chassis support member,” “means formed in the chassis support member for enabling slidable engagement of the coupling means with the chassis support member” and “means for aligning the coupling means with the means for enabling slidable engagement “ (emphasis added). At least for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that *Davis* also does not anticipate independent Claims 8 and 15.

Claims 2-7, 9-14 and 16-19 that depend respectively from independent Claims 1, 8 and 15 are also not anticipated by *Davis* at least because they incorporate the limitations of respective Claims 1, 8 and 15 and also add additional elements that further distinguish *Davis*. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-19 be withdrawn.

NEW CLAIMS

Applicants add new Claims 20-22. New Claims 21 and 22 depend from new independent Claim 20. Applicants respectfully submit that new Claims 20-22 are patentable over the applied reference. Thus, Applicants respectfully request allowance of new Claims 20-22.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

With the presentation of new Claims 20-22, an excess claim fee of \$300.00 pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 is believed due. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge \$300.00 to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company to cover the excess claim fee. If, however, Applicants have miscalculated the fee due with this Response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment associated with this Response to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company.

Respectfully submitted,

By: James L. Baudino
James L. Baudino
Reg. No. 43,486

Date: June 13, 2006

Correspondence to:
L.Joy Griebenow
Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
Tel. 970-898-3884